

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,528	05/15/2001	Toru Suzuki	00653/01-F-011US/UA	8224
513 7	7590 07/30/2004	EXAMINER		
WENDEROT	TH, LIND & PONAC	HOFFMANI	HOFFMANN, JOHN M	
2033 K STREI SUITE 800	2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006-1021		1731	

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/854,528	SUZUKI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		John Hoffmann	1731			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ 2a)⊠ 3)□	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,12 and 13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,12 and 13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examir The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiration is objected to be a control in the Examiration is objected to be a control in the Examiration is objected to be a control in the Examiration is objected to be a control in the Examiration is objected to be a control in the Examiration is objected to be a control in the Examiration is objected to be a control in the Examiration is objected to be	ccepted or b) objected to by the fine drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See action is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)□ a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure see the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati iority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen 1) Notic	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

Application/Control Number: 09/854,528

Art Unit: 1731

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "colloid process" is indefinite to its meaning – to the degree that one of ordinary skill would not be able to tell the metes and bounds of the invention. First, the specification does not have any definition for this term. Although page 11 of the specification lists some methods by the term, one of ordinary skill would not consider this to be a definition.

Second, new claims 12-13 refer to sizes of 1.0 micron and 0.69 micron.

However, as per the Grant & Hackh's chemical dictionary page 145 (col. 2, lines 4-5) indicates that 0.1 micron is the largest dimension for something to be a colloid. One of ordinary skill would be confused as to whether the term "colloid process" can encompass non-colloid systems (such as particles larger than 0.1 micron) or not.

Third, applicant argues in the paper of June 29 that the Giessen process is not a colloid process because it does not have any "special external force". However, applicant's examples of page 11 do not have the special external force similar to that of the slip casting – especially the tape casting.

Application/Control Number: 09/854,528

Art Unit: 1731

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei 5518660 alone, or in view of Applicant's admission on pages 1-2 of the specification and Van Nostrand's Scientific Encyclopedia (6th ed.)

See Wei, col. 3, lines 28-44. Wei does not disclose a magnetic field. Van Nostrand, page 981, col. 2, 2nd full paragraph discloses that there is a magnetic field over the surface of the earth. It would have been obvious to perform the Wei process on the surface of the earth (i.e. in the magnetic field of the earth) because that would be the cheapest place to do it. The disclosed slip casting is deemed to be a colloid process because Applicant's discloses that slip casting is a colloid process.

The preamble of the claim calls for "an oriented sintered ceramic product". First, it is noted that it does not appear that the preamble breathes life an meaning into the claim. However, it would been inherent that the sintered ceramic product would have been oriented in the sintering furnace, or oriented in its final package. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to package it firmly in a box, so that it can be easily shipped, stacked, protected, etc.

Application/Control Number: 09/854,528

Art Unit: 1731

Alternatively, Applicant's disclosure is relied upon to show it is known to make "oriented" sintered products from alumina to increase their strength. IT would have been obvious to orient the Wei product to increase its strength.

It is noted from page 11, lines 7-10 of the present specification, that Applicant intends the term "magnetic field" to encompass weak fields.

Claims 2-3 and 10-11 are clearly met from the above cited portion of Wei.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1731

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Hoffmann whose telephone number is (571) 272 1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic 7-27-04

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Iof∰hann

imh